

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 25, 2004, has been reviewed, and in view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that previously dependent claims 4-7, 14, 16 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claims 4-6, 14 and 16 into independent form, placing them in condition for allowance. In addition, new claims 23 and 24 corresponding to claims 14 and 16 have been added. Notification of the allowability of those claims will be appreciated.

The previous independent claims (claims 1, 10, 20 and 21) have also been amended to more clearly state the inventions. No new matter is added with those amendments.

The Independent Claims Clearly Overcome the Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020087516 to Cras in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,750 to Petculescu. Applicants believe that this rejection is improper for reasons detailed below and as clarified in the amendments to the independent claims.

Specifically, taking claim 1 as an example, claim 1 recites a system for "generating one or more query language statements." The various elements recited in claim 1 perform various functions as part of the process of generating those statements. Thus, for clarity, amendments have been made to claim 1 to state that purpose.

In contrast, Cras and Petculescu are not concerned with checking and validating query language statements that have been manually created by a user writing them out. The Office Action's selection of citations from Cras demonstrates that nowhere is Cras indicating that a

query language statement is being generated. Paragraph 428 of Cras, for example, describes “checking the syntax” - not selecting it for “generating one or more query language statements.” The reference in paragraph 490 of Cras to “building SQL queries” refers to a manual process whereby a human user can go into the metadata library to select objects to manually build SQL queries. Nothing in this discussion suggests a system that automates SQL generation based on inputs of a desired data set and desired function as recited in claim 1. The amendments specifying that various action are automated further clarify that these are actions performed by a computer based on inputs that may be provided either from a human or a computer. The inputs, however, are function and data set.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 10, 20 and 21 and thus, those claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no additional fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Date: June 25, 2004

By: 
Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500
(202) 778-2201 (fax)